

1 KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP  
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065  
3 rvannest@keker.com  
4 SHARIF E. JACOB - # 257546  
sjacob@keker.com  
PAVEN MALHOTRA - # 258429  
pmalhotra@keker.com  
MICHELLE YBARRA - # 260697  
mybarra@keker.com  
DAVID J. ROSEN - #296139  
drosen@keker.com  
EDWARD A. BAYLEY - # 267532  
ebayley@keker.com  
LUIS G. HOYOS - #313019  
lhoyos@keker.com  
633 Battery Street  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: 415 391 5400  
Facsimile: 415 397 7188

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
12 NETFLIX, INC.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 BROADCOM CORPORATION, et al.,  
17 Plaintiffs,  
18 v.  
19 NETFLIX, INC.,  
20 Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-04677-JD

**DEFENDANT NETFLIX, INC.'S NOTICE  
OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RULE  
37 SANCTIONS**

Date: July 21, 2022  
Time: 10:00 AM  
Dept.: Courtroom 11, 19th Floor  
Judge: Honorable James Donato

Date Filed: March 13, 2020  
Trial Date: None Set

1  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2	I.	BACKGROUND .....	4
3	A.	Plaintiffs improperly withhold licenses to the Patents-in-Suit for over a	
4		year.....	4
5	B.	Plaintiffs refuse to produce licenses in a separate, unrelated action and	
6		impose onerous restrictions on Netflix's review .....	5
7	C.	Plaintiffs refuse to allow Netflix to review licenses to the Patents-in-Suit,	
8		in violation of the Court's May 16 order .....	6
9	II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	7
10	III.	ARGUMENT .....	8
11	A.	Plaintiffs disobeyed the Court's May 16 order .....	8
12	B.	The Court should order Plaintiffs to produce Bates-stamped copies of the	
13		licenses.....	9
14	C.	The Court should hold Plaintiffs in contempt until they comply and award	
15		Netflix's reasonable expenses.....	12
16	IV.	CONCLUSION.....	13
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1  
2                   TABLE OF AUTHORITIES  
3

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Bio-Rad Lab'ys v. 10X Genomics, Inc.</i> , 967 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	10, 11
<i>CA, Inc. et al. v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , Case No. 2:21-cv-00080-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex. filed Mar. 9, 2021) .....	3, 5
<i>Dae Sung Hi Tech Co. v. GThunder, Ltd.</i> , 2019 WL 8884093 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2019) .....	2, 7
<i>Dahl v. City of Huntington Beach</i> , 84 F.3d 363 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	8
<i>In re Dual-Deck Video Cassette Antitrust Lit.</i> , 10 F.3d 693 (9th Cir. 1993) .....	7
<i>Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Meril Life Scis. Pvt. Ltd.</i> , 2022 WL 566792 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2022).....	8, 9
<i>Ennova Rsch. SRL v. Beebell Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 285797 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2019).....	13
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	11
<i>France Telecom, S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 12145894 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2013) .....	10, 12
<i>Garcia v. Bana</i> , 2012 WL 2119157 (N.D. Cal. June 9, 2012) .....	9
<i>HRC-Hainan Holding Co., LLC v. Yihan Hu</i> , 2020 WL 1643786 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2020) .....	9, 12, 13
<i>Ins. Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Beauxites de Guinee</i> , 456 U.S. 694 (1982).....	8, 9
<i>Int'l Union United Mine Workers of Am. v. Bagwell</i> , 512 U.S. 821 (1994).....	12
<i>LegalForce RAPC Worldwide P.C. v. Demassa</i> , 2019 WL 5395038 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2019).....	8

1	<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Hon Hai Precision Indus. Co.,</i> 2020 WL 8991669 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2020) .....	9, 13
2		
3	<i>Phoenix Sols. Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,</i> 254 F.R.D. 568 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	10
4		
5	<i>Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants,</i> 959 F.2d 1468 (9th Cir. 1992) .....	12
6		
7	<i>Snowflake Inc. v. Yeti Data, Inc.,</i> 2021 WL 1056550 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2021).....	12
8		
9	<i>Va. Panel Corp. v. MAC Panel Co.,</i> 133 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	11
10		
11	<i>Valley Eng's Inc. v. Elec. Eng'g Co.,</i> 158 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	8
12		
13	<i>Wyeth v. Orgenus Pharma Inc.,</i> 2010 WL 4117157 (D.N.J. Oct. 19, 2010).....	10
14		
15	<b>Other Authorities</b>	
16	<i>Fed. R. Civ. P. 37.....</i>	1, 2, 9
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

## **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

**TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on July 21, 2022 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, in Courtroom 11, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, Defendant Netflix, Inc. (“Netflix”), by and through its undersigned counsel, will move the Honorable James Donato for (1) an order directing Broadcom Corporation and Avago Technologies International Sales PTE Limited (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) to produce all licenses to the Patents-in-Suit, or, alternatively, to make the licenses available for Netflix’s review pursuant to the Court’s May 16, 2022 order; (2) an order directing Plaintiffs to show cause why this Court should not hold them in contempt, requiring them to pay a coercive sanction of \$2,000 per day, until Plaintiffs produce or otherwise make the licenses available as directed by the Court; and (3) an order directing Plaintiffs and/or Plaintiffs’ counsel to pay Netflix’s reasonable expenses, including attorney’s and expert fees, caused by their failure to comply with the Court’s May 16, 2022 order.

This motion is made under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37, Civil Local Rules 7 and 37-4, and the authorities cited herein. This motion is based on this Notice of Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Michelle Ybarra, and accompanying exhibits, the complete files and records of this action, the arguments of counsel, and all other material that may properly come before the court or before the hearing on this Motion.

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

It is axiomatic that “[c]ompliance with court orders is not optional.” *Dae Sung Hi Tech Co. v. GThunder, Ltd.*, 2019 WL 8884093, at \*1 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2019). Yet nearly a month after this Court ordered Plaintiffs to schedule a time for Netflix’s expert and counsel to review Plaintiffs’ 2,400 licenses to the Patents-in-Suit, they still have not complied. *See* Dkt. 212. Instead, Plaintiffs conditioned their compliance with the Court’s order on Netflix’s agreement to an unnecessary and onerous review protocol that purports to dictate all aspects of Netflix’s review, down to the specific information that Netflix’s counsel and expert may record in their notes. These restrictions were not proposed by Plaintiffs at the May 16, 2022 hearing; nor do they appear anywhere in the Court’s May 16, 2022 order. When Netflix declined to agree to them, Plaintiffs failed to appear for a meet and confer and refused to allow Netflix access to the licenses at all, turning away Netflix’s counsel and expert representative when they showed up for review.

Plaintiffs' violation of the Court's order is inexcusable. Indeed, Plaintiffs' only purported justification for requiring Netflix to review the licenses at their counsel's offices rested on the licenses' notice requirements, which Plaintiffs claim prevent them from producing the licenses without first notifying third-party licensees. Even though Plaintiffs concede that the licenses cover the Patents-in-Suit—and therefore should have been produced along with Plaintiffs' January 5, 2021 infringement contentions pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-2—Plaintiffs apparently never made any effort to notify third-parties that the licenses must be provided in discovery.

At the May 16 hearing, Plaintiffs represented to the Court that all of Plaintiffs' 2,400 licenses were subject to these notice requirements, and that because Plaintiffs had failed to provide notice to third-parties, Netflix must review the licenses at Plaintiffs' counsel's office. See Decl. of Michelle Ybarra in Supp. of Def.'s Mot. for R. 37 Sanctions ("Ybarra Decl."), Ex. C at 69:22–25 ("All these licenses require notice letters to be sent to the third party saying that we're

1 going to produce their – the confidential license agreement to Netflix.”).<sup>1</sup> Eager to review  
 2 Plaintiffs’ licenses and in the interest of avoiding further dispute, Netflix agreed to conduct the  
 3 review at Plaintiffs’ counsel’s office. Plaintiffs neither raised nor requested that the Court impose  
 4 any additional restrictions on Netflix’s review, and the Court ordered Plaintiffs to schedule the  
 5 review by no later than May 23, 2022. *See* Dkt. 212.

6 Plaintiffs failed to do so. Instead, they refused to provide Netflix access to their licenses  
 7 absent Netflix’s agreement to onerous and unnecessary review restrictions that were nearly  
 8 identical to those imposed by Magistrate Judge Payne in *CA v. Netflix*, a separate case concerning  
 9 different patents brought by Broadcom’s affiliates in the Eastern District of Texas. The  
 10 restrictions on Netflix’s review of Plaintiffs’ licenses in that case were imposed over Netflix’s  
 11 objection and required Netflix’s counsel and expert to review the licenses without the assistance  
 12 of pen, paper, access to their case notes, or any other work product, among other things. The  
 13 resulting review was burdensome, costly, and inefficient.

14 Even though Plaintiffs never requested or moved this Court to order those same  
 15 restrictions here, Plaintiffs refused to comply with the Court’s May 16 order unless Netflix agreed  
 16 to a similar protocol in this case. When Netflix objected, Plaintiffs canceled the review and  
 17 denied Netflix’s counsel and expert access to the licenses. Plaintiffs argued that even though the  
 18 Court’s order is silent on this issue, the restrictions are inherent. Not so.<sup>2</sup> In any event, Plaintiffs  
 19 did not move for a protective order or request that the Court clarify its order. Instead, they  
 20 engaged in self-help and opted to willfully disobey the Court’s directive. The prejudice to Netflix  
 21 is manifest; Plaintiffs’ refusal to comply with the May 16 order has delayed Netflix’s damages  
 22 analysis and development of its patent misuse defense. Plaintiffs must not be allowed to violate  
 23 the Court’s order with impunity.

---

24 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs’ counsel recently admitted that this statement was false, conceding that he had no idea  
 25 whether all the licenses are subject to the notice requirements Plaintiffs described at the hearing.  
*See* Ybarra Decl., Ex. M at 9:3–7.

26 <sup>2</sup> Netflix agreed that its reviewers would not print, copy, download, or remove any of Plaintiffs’  
 27 licenses, and that Plaintiffs’ licenses and any notes taken by Netflix’s counsel and expert about  
 28 the licenses would be designated HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY  
 under the Stipulated Protective Order. Ybarra Decl., Ex. J. Plaintiffs rejected Netflix’s proposal  
 and continue to deny Netflix access to the licenses.

1           Accordingly, Netflix respectfully asks the Court to (1) order Plaintiffs to produce Bates-  
 2 stamped copies of all licenses to the Patents-in-Suit, or, alternatively, to make the licenses  
 3 available for Netflix's review without the unnecessary and unwarranted review restrictions  
 4 Plaintiffs seek to impose; (2) hold Plaintiffs in contempt, requiring them to pay a coercive  
 5 sanction of \$2,000 per day until Plaintiffs produce or otherwise make the licenses available as  
 6 directed by the Court; and (3) order Plaintiffs and/or their counsel to pay Netflix's reasonable  
 7 expenses caused by their failure to comply with the Court's order.

8 **I. BACKGROUND**

9           **A. Plaintiffs improperly withhold licenses to the Patents-in-Suit for over a year**

10          Plaintiffs filed this suit on March 20, 2020, in the District Court for the Central District of  
 11 California, and on July 10, 2020, the Honorable James V. Selna ordered the case transferred to  
 12 this Court. *See* Dkts. 1, 62. On January 5, 2021, Plaintiffs served their disclosure of asserted  
 13 claims and infringement contentions pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-1. Plaintiffs were required to  
 14 provide all licenses to the Patents-in-Suit by the same date. *See* Patent L.R. 3-2 (requiring a patent  
 15 plaintiff to produce or provide "all agreements, including licenses, transferring an interest in any  
 16 patent-in-suit"). But Plaintiffs' January 5, 2021 document production did not include all licenses  
 17 to the Patents-in-Suit. Ybarra Decl. ¶ 2. In fact, Plaintiffs did not produce any licenses until July  
 18 21, 2021, and even then only after Netflix sought a meet-and-confer with Plaintiffs over their  
 19 deficient production. *Id.* ¶ 3. Plaintiffs' July 21, 2021 production included only fourteen license  
 20 agreements. *Id.* Plaintiffs did not inform Netflix that they were withholding any licenses to the  
 21 Patents-in-Suit, let alone thousands of licenses. *Id.*

22          On September 8, 2021, the parties conferred over Netflix's discovery requests, including  
 23 Netflix's May 27, 2021 request for production of portfolio licenses covering the Patents-in-Suit.  
 24 *Id.*, ¶¶ 4 & 5. Plaintiffs objected to the production of portfolio licenses as irrelevant and  
 25 burdensome, and refused to supplement their production except as to *two* portfolio licenses.<sup>3</sup> *Id.*,  
 26 ¶ 5. At no point during the conference did Plaintiffs inform Netflix that they continued to

---

27  
 28 <sup>3</sup> To date, Plaintiffs still have not produced these two licenses. Ybarra Decl. ¶ 5.

1 withhold thousands of licenses to the Patents-in-Suit or that the burden they complained of  
 2 concerned compliance with third-party notice requirements contained in the licenses. *Id.*

3       **B. Plaintiffs refuse to produce licenses in a separate, unrelated action and**  
      **impose onerous restrictions on Netflix's review**

4       Netflix only learned the scope of Plaintiffs' withheld portfolio licenses months later, hours  
 5 before a November 12, 2021 hearing in *CA, Inc. et al. v. Netflix, Inc.*, Case No. 2:21-cv-00080-  
 6 JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex. filed Mar. 9, 2021), a separate action involving different patents in the  
 7 Eastern District of Texas (the "Texas Action"). Ybarra Decl. ¶ 6. At the hearing, Magistrate Judge  
 8 Payne heard argument on Netflix's motion to compel production of licenses, and Plaintiffs'  
 9 counsel explained that they were in possession of thousands of licenses to the patents asserted in  
 10 the Texas Action, but that the licenses could not be produced because the third-party licensees  
 11 must first be notified pursuant to confidentiality provisions contained in the licenses. *Id.*  
 12 Critically, Plaintiffs argued that the imminent close of fact discovery, just two weeks away, made  
 13 Plaintiffs' compliance with the notice provisions impractical. *Id.*

14       Instead, Plaintiffs argued that Netflix should be required to review the licenses on secure  
 15 computers in Plaintiffs' counsel's office under source code review-like conditions. The Court  
 16 granted Plaintiffs' request over Netflix's objection. *Id.*, Ex. A at 2. The restrictions requested by  
 17 Plaintiffs required Netflix's counsel and expert to conduct the review without the use of pen,  
 18 paper, access to their cell phones, laptops, case notes or work product. *Id.* ¶ 7. On the first day of  
 19 review, Plaintiffs' counsel accused Netflix of violating the protocol because Netflix's expert  
 20 brought a piece of paper reflecting the numbers of the asserted patents into the review room. *Id.*  
 21 Plaintiffs even dictated the specific, narrow categories of information Netflix's counsel and expert  
 22 could record, such as the license date, form of license and ranking or relevance; and Plaintiffs  
 23 insisted that those notes be entered into a Microsoft Excel document which could not leave the  
 24 review room. *Id.* These restrictions ensured that the review was cumbersome, costly, and slow.  
 25 Netflix completed its review of the licenses in the Texas Action on December 3, 2021. *Id.* At that  
 26 point, Netflix's requests for Plaintiffs' licenses to the Patents-in-Suit in *this case* had been  
 27 pending for 10 months. Netflix's requests are still pending. *Id.*

1           C. Plaintiffs refuse to allow Netflix to review licenses to the Patents-in-Suit, in  
 2 violation of the Court's May 16 order

3           On May 16, 2022, following the *Markman* hearing in this case, the Court addressed a  
 4 number of pending discovery disputes between the parties, including Plaintiffs' failure to produce  
 5 licenses to the Patents-in-Suit. *Id.* ¶ 8. During discussion with the Court, Plaintiffs' counsel  
 6 conceded that

7           We have thousands of portfolio-wide licenses [to the Patents-in-Suit] . . .  
 8 All these licenses require notice letters to be sent to the third party saying  
 9 that we're going to produce their – the confidential license agreement to  
 10 Netflix. 2,400 licenses, Your Honor, I believe was the number.

11           *Id.*, Ex. C at 69:14–70:1 (emphasis added). Plaintiffs' counsel went on to describe the review  
 12 ordered by Magistrate Judge Payne in the Texas Action:

13           So what we did in that particular case, with the approval of the court was,  
 14 we made -- we made those licenses available for inspection and review on  
 15 a computer in -- at a location of Netflix's choosing, which was our New  
 16 York office, and – and invited them, their expert, to come in and review the  
 17 licenses and identify which licenses they believed were -- were relevant  
 18 and they wanted produced. And then we turned around and sent out the  
 19 notice letters and produced those.

20           *Id.* at 70:2–10. Following Plaintiffs' counsel's explanation, the Court asked Netflix's counsel:

21           **The Court:** What I'm hearing, though, is someone will go and look at the  
 22 portfolio and pick the ones you want. Is that what you want to do?

23           **Netflix's counsel:** We're absolutely glad to do that and it's fairly urgent.

24           **The Court:** Let's do that.

25           *Id.* at 72:1–6. Plaintiffs did not ask the Court to impose any specific restrictions on Netflix's  
 26 review of the licenses, nor did the Court do so *sua sponte*. Immediately following the hearing, the  
 27 Court issued a minute order, directing Plaintiffs to "schedule by May 23, 2022, a time for  
 28 Netflix's expert and one attorney to review, at plaintiffs' counsel's office in San Francisco,  
 Broadcom's licenses." *Id.*, Ex. B.

29           Netflix promptly arranged for its damages expert and counsel to arrive at Plaintiffs'  
 30 counsel's San Francisco office to begin review. *Id.* ¶ 9. But on May 18, 2022, just prior to  
 31 Plaintiffs' deadline for compliance with the order, Plaintiffs sent Netflix a draft "review protocol"  
 32 nearly identical to the one imposed in the Texas Action over Netflix's objection. *Id.*, Ex. D.

1 Netflix objected that the Court’s May 16 order did not contain any of the restrictions Plaintiffs  
 2 sought to belatedly impose but noted that the Stipulated Protective Order provided ample existing  
 3 protection for confidential information. *Id.*, Exs. E & F. Plaintiffs refused to allow Netflix to  
 4 begin review, claiming that the restrictions Plaintiffs sought to impose were “entirely consistent  
 5 with the discussion during [the May 16] hearing.” *Id.*, Ex. G. On May 23, 2022, Netflix  
 6 confirmed its agreement to treat all of Plaintiffs’ licenses as HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
 7 ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY and not to copy or download the licenses, consistent with the  
 8 guidance provided by the Court at the May 16, 2022 hearing. *Id.*, Ex. J. Netflix also appeared for  
 9 a meet and confer that same morning at Plaintiffs’ request, but Plaintiffs did not bother to show  
 10 up. *Id.* ¶¶ 14 & 15, Ex. H. Instead, they sent an email proclaiming that the parties “do not need to  
 11 meet and confer on the license issue today” because “[t]he transcript of the May 16 hearing  
 12 confirms that the license review should be conducted under a procedure to protect third-party  
 13 confidential information as in the Texas case.” *Id.*, Ex. I. Plaintiffs’ counsel also confirmed that  
 14 “neither Netflix’s attorneys nor expert will be allowed in Holland & Knight’s offices” until  
 15 Netflix agreed to Plaintiffs’ review restrictions. *Id.*, Ex. J. On May 24, 2022, Netflix’s counsel  
 16 and a representative of Netflix’s damages expert arrived at Plaintiff’s counsel’s San Francisco  
 17 office to begin review as planned and were denied entry. *Id.* ¶ 17.

18 Despite Plaintiffs’ intransigence, Netflix continued to seek Plaintiffs’ compliance with the  
 19 Court’s May 16 order without motion practice. On June 6, 2022, Netflix proposed a formal  
 20 review protocol memorializing additional protections aimed at addressing Plaintiffs’ third-party  
 21 confidentiality concerns. *See Id.*, Ex. K. Netflix again invited Plaintiffs to meet and confer about  
 22 the license review on June 7, 2022. *Id.* At the June 7 conference, Plaintiffs rejected Netflix’s  
 23 proposed review protocol, and confirmed they would not allow Netflix to review Plaintiffs’  
 24 licenses absent Netflix’s agreement to additional, unnecessary restrictions. *Id.* ¶ 18, Exs. L & M.  
 25 This motion follows.

26 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

27 “Compliance with court orders is not optional.” *Dae Sung*, 2019 WL 8884093, at \*1. Nor  
 28 is there a “good faith exception” to a party’s duty to obey a court order. *In re Dual-Deck Video*

1 *Cassette Antitrust Lit.*, 10 F.3d 693, 695 (9th Cir. 1993). When a litigant disobeys a discovery  
 2 order, Rule 37(b)(2)(A) authorizes a Court to sanction that party by issuing “just orders,”  
 3 including, for example, an order treating the failure to obey as contempt of court. The exemplary  
 4 “just orders” identified in Rule 37(b)(2)(A) “are not intended to constitute an exhaustive list of  
 5 the orders a judge may issue as sanctions.” *Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Meril Life Scis. Pvt.*  
 6 *Ltd.*, 2022 WL 566792, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2022) (cleaned up). Rather, the Court has broad  
 7 discretion to fashion sanctions for violation of a discovery order, provided that the order is “just”  
 8 and “specifically related to the particular ‘claim’ which was at issue in the order to provide  
 9 discovery.” *Ins. Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Beauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694, 707  
 10 (1982).<sup>4</sup> Where a party disobeys a discovery order without substantial justification, monetary  
 11 sanctions are also warranted. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(C); LegalForce RAPC Worldwide P.C.*  
 12 *v. Demassa*, 2019 WL 5395038, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2019).

### 13 III. ARGUMENT

#### 14 A. Plaintiffs disobeyed the Court’s May 16 order

15 It is beyond dispute that the Court ordered Plaintiffs to “schedule by May 23, 2022, a time  
 16 for Netflix’s expert and one attorney to review, at plaintiff’s counsel’s office in San Francisco,  
 17 Broadcom’s licenses.” Ybarra Decl., Ex. B. It is also beyond dispute that Plaintiffs failed to do so.  
 18 These facts alone are sufficient to establish that Plaintiffs disobeyed the Court’s May 16 order.

19 Plaintiffs’ sole justification for their violation is their contention that “[t]he transcript of  
 20 the May 16 hearing confirms that the license review should be conducted under a procedure to  
 21 protect third-party confidential information as in the Texas case.” *Id.*, Ex. I. That position is  
 22 belied by the record. The May 16, 2022 hearing transcript shows that the Court never once  
 23 referenced the review protocol ordered by Magistrate Judge Payne in the Texas Action, let alone  
 24 ordered Netflix to abide by it. In fact, the terms of the Texas protocol were not discussed at all  
 25 during the May 16 hearing.

---

26  
 27 <sup>4</sup> *See also Dahl v. City of Huntington Beach*, 84 F.3d 363, 367 (9th Cir. 1996); *Valley Eng’s Inc.*  
 28 *v. Elec. Eng’g Co.*, 158 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 1998) (“[T]he central factor in evaluating the  
 district court order is justice[.]”).

Rather, at the hearing, the Court questioned the validity of Plaintiffs' concerns about third-party confidentiality, given that Netflix could "not to copy, download, or anything else," *Id.*, Ex. C at 72:24–25, consistent with the parties' March 15, 2021 Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. 105. The Court neither ordered nor even suggested the draconian and unnecessary restrictions on review imposed in the Texas Action; nor did Plaintiffs ever request the Court apply those restrictions in this case. In fact, Netflix informed Plaintiffs that the restrictions imposed in the Texas Action were inapplicable in this case on May 20—*three days* before Plaintiffs' compliance with the Court's order was due. Ybarra Decl., Ex. E. Netflix's counsel also informed Plaintiffs that any confidential information contained in the licenses was already protected by the terms of the Stipulated Protective Order entered in this case. *Id.*, Ex. F, J. Plaintiffs had ample time to seek a protective order, or at the very least to ask the Court for clarification, before compliance was required. They failed to do so. *See HRC-Hainan Holding Co., LLC v. Yihan Hu*, 2020 WL 1643786, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2020) (issuing sanctions and holding party in contempt because "[t]he timing of their stay motion unavoidably put them in violation of the February 25 order, and that could have been prevented by moving for a stay promptly").

**B. The Court should order Plaintiffs to produce Bates-stamped copies of the licenses**

Where a party has shown "continued delay" and "obvious disregard" for a court's orders, sanctions under Rule 37 are appropriate. *Ins. Corp. of Ireland*, 456 U.S. at 707–08. Indeed, courts routinely invoke their Rule 37 authority by ordering disobeying parties to produce withheld documents in short order. *See e.g., Edwards Lifesciences Corp.*, 2022 WL 566792, at \*4 (ordering production of medical records within 7 days); *Microsoft Corp. v. Hon Hai Precision Indus. Co.*, 2020 WL 8991669, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2020) (ordering production of damages-related documents within 14 days); *Garcia v. Bana*, 2012 WL 2119157, at \*10 (N.D. Cal. June 9, 2012) (ordering supplemental document production of documents within 5 days). Here, the Court should dispense with Plaintiffs' unnecessary and improper review protocol, and order Plaintiffs to produce Bates-stamped copies of the licenses to Netflix by a date-certain. This relief is necessary and appropriate for at least the following reasons.

1       ***First***, Plaintiffs have withheld licenses to the Patents-in-Suit for over sixteen months, even  
 2 though they were required to provide the licenses pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-2 in January  
 3 2021.<sup>5</sup> At the May 16 hearing, Netflix readily agreed to conduct its license review at Plaintiffs'  
 4 counsel's office in the interests of compromise and to prevent further delay. But Plaintiffs' willful  
 5 violation of the Court's May 16 order has forfeited any entitlement to this compromise position.  
 6 In any event, courts in this District and others regularly hold that third-party confidentiality  
 7 concerns are no justification for withholding licenses to the asserted patents. *See France Telecom,*  
 8 *S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor, Inc.*, 2013 WL 12145894, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2013)  
 9 (overruling patentee's objection to the production of licenses in light of third-party  
 10 confidentiality concerns and compelling production); *Wyeth v. Orgenus Pharma Inc.*, 2010 WL  
 11 4117157, at \*4 (D.N.J. Oct. 19, 2010) ("The Court notes that other courts have routinely  
 12 recognized that license agreements relating to the patent-in-suit, and entered into in connection  
 13 with settlement, are discoverable and that Plaintiff's third party confidentiality concerns do not  
 14 outweigh legitimate grounds to compel production."); *Phoenix Sols. Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank,*  
 15 *N.A.*, 254 F.R.D. 568, 583 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (overruling patentee's objection to the production of  
 16 license negotiation materials in light of third-party confidentiality concerns and compelling  
 17 production).

18       ***Second***, Plaintiffs' violation of the Court's order has denied Netflix's access to evidence  
 19 critical to its damages case and patent misuse defense. Plaintiffs contend that the licenses are  
 20 irrelevant, *see* Ex. C at 69:14–16, but that position is without merit. Juries may determine a  
 21 reasonable royalty "based . . . on the royalty to which a willing licensor and a willing licensee  
 22 would have agreed at the time the infringement began," which requires them to look at licenses  
 23 that "involve[] comparable technology, [are] economically comparable, and arise[] under  
 24 comparable circumstances." *Bio-Rad Lab'ys v. 10X Genomics, Inc.*, 967 F.3d 1353, 1372–73  
 25 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (quoting *Radio Steel & Mfg. Co. v. MTD Prods., Inc.*, 788 F.2d 1554, 1557 (Fed.  
 26

---

27       <sup>5</sup> Notably, Local Rule 3-2 requires a patent plaintiff to produce or provide licenses to the Patents-  
 28 in-Suit contemporaneously with disclosure of the patentee's infringement contentions. Nothing in  
 the Rule excuses compliance in light of third-party confidentiality.

1 Cir. 1986)). But comparable does not mean identical. In fact, the Federal Circuit has held on  
 2 multiple occasions that the “degree of comparability of the license agreements is a ‘factual issue[]  
 3 best addressed by cross examination and not by exclusion.’” *Id.* at 1374 (quoting *ActiveVideo*  
 4 *Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *see also Ericsson, Inc.*  
 5 *v. D-Link Sys., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1201, 1227 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“[T]he fact that a license is not  
 6 perfectly analogous generally goes to the weight of the evidence, not its admissibility.”).  
 7 Moreover, of the licenses that Plaintiffs produced to Netflix in 2021, several are portfolio licenses  
 8 that do not specifically identify the Patents-in-Suit, and are therefore indistinguishable from the  
 9 2,400 licenses that Plaintiffs contend are irrelevant.<sup>6</sup> Plaintiffs cannot cherry-pick and produce the  
 10 portfolio licenses that they deem supportive of their case while denying Netflix access to the  
 11 others.

12       **Third**, Plaintiffs’ failure to comply with the Court’s order has further delayed and  
 13 prejudiced Netflix’s ability to prepare its case for trial. Specifically, Plaintiffs’ violation of the  
 14 Court’s order has delayed Netflix’s damages analysis and development of its patent misuse  
 15 defense. Plaintiffs have conditioned at least one license to the Patents-in-Suit on the licensee’s  
 16 payment of certain fees and the purchase of certain products that are unrelated to the subject  
 17 matter within the scope of the patent’s claims. Such tying arrangements are *per se* unlawful and  
 18 constitute patent misuse. *See Va. Panel Corp. v. MAC Panel Co.*, 133 F.3d 860, 869 (Fed. Cir.  
 19 1997). Netflix is entitled to review Plaintiffs’ licenses in order to identify any other unlawful  
 20 tying arrangements Plaintiffs entered into.

21       **Finally**, Plaintiffs’ sole justification for requiring Netflix to conduct in-office review of  
 22 the licenses rather than producing Bates-stamped copies is a problem of their own making. The  
 23 Patent Local Rules made clear from the start of the case that the licenses are relevant and  
 24 discoverable. Nevertheless, over the last sixteen months, Plaintiffs apparently made no effort to  
 25 comply with the third-party notice requirements that they now claim prohibit production. Worse,

---

26       <sup>6</sup> Plaintiffs’ counsel represented to the Court that “for all of licenses that specifically named any  
 27 of the patents in this lawsuit . . . all of those licenses have been produced in this case long ago,”  
 28 but “[i]t’s the broader set of portfolio-wide licenses” that were not. Ybarra Decl., Ex. C at 70:16-  
 71:2.

1 Plaintiffs' counsel's recent comments during the June 7 meet and confer reveal that Plaintiffs  
 2 have not even bothered to confirm that all the licenses require notice to third-party licensees prior  
 3 to production, even though counsel represented this was so to the Court. *Compare* Ybarra Decl.,  
 4 Ex. C at 69:22–25 (“All these licenses require notice letters to be sent to the third party saying  
 5 that we’re going to produce their – the confidential license agreement to Netflix.”) *with Id.*, Ex. M  
 6 at 9:3–7 (“I haven’t studied every single one of them to know whether they all do, but the vast  
 7 majority [of the licenses] are going to contain requirements of notice to the third parties before  
 8 production of the information.”).

9 Accordingly, the Court should order Plaintiffs to produce Bates-stamped copies of the  
 10 licenses with appropriate designations under the Stipulated Protective Order, which is more than  
 11 sufficient to protect any third-party confidentiality interests potentially at issue. *See, e.g., France*  
 12 *Telecom*, 2013 WL 12145894, at \*1. Alternatively, the Court should order Plaintiffs to comply  
 13 with the Court’s May 16 order and make the licenses available for Netflix’s immediate review,  
 14 without any additional restrictions.

15       **C.     The Court should hold Plaintiffs in contempt until they comply and award**  
 16       **Netflix’s reasonable expenses**

17       The Court should also hold Plaintiffs in contempt for their ongoing violation of the  
 18 Court’s May 16 order and require them to pay \$2,000 per day until they comply with any relief  
 19 the Court orders following this motion. “Contempts such as failure to comply with document  
 20 discovery, for example . . . touch upon the core justification for the contempt power.” *Int’l Union*  
*United Mine Workers of Am. v. Bagwell*, 512 U.S. 821, 833 (1994). “Where the purpose of a civil  
 21 contempt sanction is to coerce good faith efforts to comply with a discovery request, contempt is  
 22 proper.” *Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants*, 959 F.2d 1468, 1480 (9th Cir. 1992).  
 23 Courts in this district routinely hold parties in contempt for ongoing violations of discovery  
 24 orders, often imposing daily sanctions until the parties can show compliance. *See e.g., Snowflake*  
*Inc. v. Yeti Data, Inc.*, 2021 WL 1056550, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2021) (\$10,000 per day);  
 25 *HRC-Hainan Holding Co.*, 2020 WL 1643786, at \*5 (\$2,000 per day). Here, coercive sanctions  
 26 are particularly warranted in light of Plaintiffs’ years-long failure to abide by their discovery  
 27

1 obligations and willful disobedience of the Court's May 16 order. Plaintiffs have demonstrated  
 2 that nothing short of contempt will compel compliance with their discovery obligations.

3 Likewise, the Court should order Plaintiffs to reimburse Netflix for all reasonable  
 4 expenses caused by Plaintiffs' failure to obey the May 16 order because Plaintiffs' failure was not  
 5 substantially justified. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(C).*<sup>7</sup> Plaintiffs' failure to comply with the May  
 6 16 order is inexcusable. As discussed above, though Plaintiffs contend their refusal to make the  
 7 licenses available for Netflix's review was motivated by third-party confidentiality concerns, the  
 8 protections provided by the Stipulated Protective Order are more than sufficient to address  
 9 Plaintiffs' concerns. Moreover, Netflix agreed to designate the licenses and any of Netflix's  
 10 counsel's or expert's notes about the licenses as HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS'  
 11 EYES ONLY. *See* Ybarra Decl., Ex. J. Netflix further agreed that its counsel and experts would  
 12 not print, copy, download, remove, or otherwise transfer the licenses onto any recordable media  
 13 or device. *Id.* If Plaintiffs believed further restrictions on Netflix's review were required, they  
 14 were obligated to seek a protective order or guidance from the Court before compliance was due.  
 15 They did not. Instead, Plaintiffs attempted to unilaterally impose draconian review restrictions on  
 16 Netflix, and when Netflix objected, Plaintiffs denied Netflix access to critical discovery, forcing  
 17 Netflix to bring this motion. Accordingly, the Court should order Plaintiffs to reimburse Netflix  
 18 for any expenses, including attorney's fees, caused by their failure to comply with the May 16  
 19 order.<sup>8</sup>

20 **IV. CONCLUSION**

21 For the reasons stated herein, Netflix respectfully asks the Court to (1) order Plaintiffs to  
 22 produce Bates-stamped copies of all licenses to the Patents-in-Suit; (2) hold Plaintiffs in  
 23 contempt, requiring them to pay a coercive sanction of \$2,000 per day, until they produce or

---

24  
 25 <sup>7</sup> *See also Microsoft*, 2020 WL 8991669, at \*5 (awarding reasonable expenses, including  
 26 attorney's fees, caused by party's failure to comply with discovery order); *HRC-Hainan Holding*  
 27 *Co.*, 2020 WL 1643786, at \*4-5 (\$24,931 in reasonable expenses); *Ennova Rsch. SRL v. Beebell*  
*Inc.*, 2019 WL 285797, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2019) (awarding \$7,539.18 in reasonable  
 expenses).

28 <sup>8</sup> Upon the Court's request, Netflix will provide the Court a fees declaration detailing the  
 reasonable expenses necessitated by Plaintiffs' violation of the May 16 order.

1 otherwise make the licenses available as directed by the Court; and (3) order Plaintiffs and/or  
2 Plaintiffs' counsel to pay Netflix's reasonable expenses, including attorney's and expert fees,  
3 caused by their failure to comply with the Court's May 16 order.

4  
5 Respectfully submitted,

6 Dated: June 13, 2022

KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP

7  
8 By: /s/ Michelle Ybarra  
9 ROBERT A. VAN NEST  
10 SHARIF E. JACOB  
PAVEN MALHOTRA  
MICHELLE YBARRA  
EDWARD A. BAYLEY  
LUIS G. HOYOS

11  
12 Attorneys for Defendant  
NETFLIX, INC.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28